

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 9 are amended.

Claims 3-4 and 12 are canceled.

New claims 15-17 are added.

Claims 1-2 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stewart et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,019; hereinafter "Stewart").

Claim 4 has been canceled. Thus, the rejection as it applies to claim 4 is moot.

Regarding claim 1, Stewart does not disclose a first conductive part provided in the casing so as to be exposed from a rear face of the casing, a second conductive part provided in the casing so as to be exposed from a bottom face or side face of the casing, and a passive element provided between the second conductive part and the ground plane of the circuit board, wherein the second conductive part is electrically connected to the ground plane of the circuit board through the passive element.

According to Stewart, the shield can 621, which corresponds to the first and second conductive parts of the invention of claim 1, is coupled to the back of the PCB (Stewart, column 7, lines 50-51), and sandwiched between the PCB 615 and the rear section 610, as shown in Fig. 6a. Since the casing is shown exploded in Figs. 1-10 of Stewart, the rear face of the assembled casing is actually the rear face of the rear section in each figure of Stewart. From this standpoint, the shield can 621 is not exposed from the rear face of the rear section 610. The Advisory Action states that Stewart clearly shows the intention is to have the conductor exposed/viewable at least at the side face in Figs. 1-8, specifically Fig. 8. However, the invention of claim 1 requires that the first conductive part be exposed from the rear face of the casing. For the first conductor, being exposed at the side face is not sufficient to create the present invention. No

conductor disclosed in Stewart is exposed from the rear face of the rear section, as shown in, for example, Figs. 1-8. For example, Figs. 6a and 6b clearly show that the shield can 621 is covered with the rear section 610, and is not exposed from the rear face of the rear section 610.

Also, Stewart fails to show the feature regarding "passive element." No element disclosed in Stewart corresponds to the passive element of the claim 1 invention. Because Stewart fails to disclose the passive element of the present invention, Stewart does not disclose that the second conductive part is electrically connected to the ground plane of the circuit board through the passive element.

Therefore, since every limitation of claim 1 is not taught by the reference, claim 1 is not fully anticipated by Stewart. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 5 which are dependent from claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

Claims 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sadler et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,136,681; hereinafter "Sadler").

Claim 12 has been canceled. Thus, the rejection as it applies to claim 12 is moot.

Regarding claim 6, Sadler does not disclose a conductor part provided between the rear face of the casing and the circuit board. Sadler's shield cans 1064 and 1066, which corresponds to the conductor part of the invention of claim 6, are not provided between the rear face of the rear cover member 1020, which corresponds to the rear face of the casing of the present invention, and the circuit board 1030, but is provided between the front cover assembly 1001 and the circuit board 1030. For that reason, the device disclosed in Sadler is structurally completely different from the device of claim 6. The Advisory Action states that Sadler teaches the conductor part is provided between the rear face of the casing (1010) and the circuit board (1030). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The element (1010) is the front cover assembly which is not a casing but a component of the casing. Thus, the rear face of the front cover assembly is not the rear face of the casing. Since the casing is shown exploded in Fig. 13 of Sadler, the rear face of the assembled casing is actually the right side of the rear cover member (1020) in Fig. 13 of Sadler. From this standpoint, Sadler's shield cans 1064 and 1066 are not provided

between the rear face of the rear cover member 1020 and the circuit board 1030. Therefore, since every limitation of claim 6 is not taught by the reference, claim 6 is not fully anticipated by Sadler. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 8 which are dependent from claim 6 should also be allowable for at least the same reason. In addition, regarding claim 7, Sadler does not disclose that the conductive board is arranged so as to be exposed from the rear face of the casing. The Advisory Action states that the conductive board (1062) is exposed/viewable from the rear face and front face of the front cover as the brand which is etched on the conductive board is visible. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Although the brand 153 is viewable through the LCD lens 112, it is not exposed but covered with the LCD lens 112. Moreover, the LCD lens 112 is not located at the rear cover member 120, but at the front cover member 110. Thus, there is not way to have the brand 153 exposed from the rear face of the casing. Therefore, the conductive board cannot be exposed from the rear cover member 120 even through the LCD lens.

Regarding claim 9, Sadler does not disclose a second conductive part provided between the rear face of the casing and the circuit board, and a passive element provided between the second conductive part and the ground plane of the circuit board, wherein the second conductive part is electrically connected to the ground plane of the circuit board through the passive element.

Sadler's shield cans 1064 and 1066, which corresponds to the second conductive part of the invention of claim 9, are not provided between the rear face of the rear cover member 1020, which corresponds to the rear face of the casing of the present invention, and the circuit board 1030, but is provided between the front cover assembly 1001 and the circuit board 1030 (Sadler, Fig. 13). For that reason, the device disclosed in Sadler is structurally completely different from the device of claim 9. As described above regarding claim 6, the rear face of the assembled casing is actually the right side of the rear cover member (1020) in Fig. 13 of Sadler. From this standpoint, Sadler's shield cans 1064 and 1066 are not provided between the rear face of the rear cover member 1020 and the circuit board 1030.

Also, Sadler fails to show the feature regarding "passive element." No element

disclosed in Sadler corresponds to the passive element of the claim 9 invention. Because Sadler fails to disclose the passive element of the present invention, Sadler does not disclose that the second conductive part is electrically connected to the ground plane of the circuit board through the passive element.

Therefore, since every limitation of claim 9 is not taught by the reference, claim 9 is not fully anticipated by Sadler. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-11 and 13-14 which are dependent from claim 6 should also be allowable for at least the same reason. In addition, regarding claim 10, Sadler does not disclose that the first conductive part is provided in the casing so as to be exposed from the rear face of the casing, and the second conductive part is provided in the casing so as to be exposed from a bottom face or side face of the casing. As described above regarding claim 6, the rear face of the assembled casing is actually the right side of the rear cover member (1020) in Fig. 13 of Sadler. From this standpoint, the electrically conductive layer 1062, which corresponds to the first conductive part of the invention of claim 10, is not exposed from the rear cover member 1020, but is encased within the front cover member 1010, as shown in Fig. 13 of Sadler. Also, Sadler's shield cans 1064 and 1066, which corresponds to the second conductive part of the invention of claim 10, are not exposed from the bottom face or side face of the casing, but is sandwiched between the front cover assembly 1001 and the circuit board 1030 (Sadler, Fig. 13).

Regarding new claim 15, neither Stewart nor Sadler discloses, teaches or renders obvious that the second conductive part is exposed only from the bottom face of the casing.


Regarding new claim 16, neither Stewart nor Sadler discloses, teaches or renders obvious that the first conductive part is exposed substantially flush with the rear face of the casing, and the second conductive part is exposed substantially flush with the bottom face of the casing.

Regarding new claim 17, neither Stewart nor Sadler discloses, teaches or renders obvious that the second conductive part forms a perpendicular component with the first conductive part.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-38204.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:   
Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

May 5, 2008